

**FLATHEAD COUNTY BOARD OF ADJUSTMENT
MINUTES OF THE MEETING
APRIL 7, 2015**

**CALL TO
ORDER
6:06 pm**

A meeting of the Flathead County Board of Adjustment was called to order at approximately 6:00 p.m. at the Earl Bennett Building, Conference Rooms A and B, 1035 1st Ave W, Kalispell, Montana. Board members present were, Ole Netteberg, Cal Dyck and Roger Noble. Gina Klempel and Mark Hash had excused absences. Erik Mack and BJ Grieve represented the Flathead County Planning & Zoning Office.

There were 47 people in the audience.

**APPROVAL OF
MINUTES
6:06 pm**

Dyck motioned and Noble seconded to approve the February 3, 2015 minutes. The motion passed unanimously.

**PUBLIC
COMMENT
*(Public matters
that are within
the jurisdiction
of the Board
2-3-103 M.C.A)*
6:07 pm**

None.

**MICHAEL AND
TERI HAGER
(FZV-14-04)
6:07pm**

A request by Michael & Teri Hager for a Zoning Variance to property within the Bigfork Zoning District and zoned SAG-5 (Suburban Agricultural). The applicant is requesting a Variance to Section 5.01.030(2), "Accessory Use Restrictions", of the Flathead County Zoning Regulations. If granted, the requested Variance would allow the applicant to construct a garage within the front yard setback. The property is located at 664 Echo View Drive.

STAFF REPORT

Mack reviewed Staff Report FZV-14-04 for the Board.

**BOARD
QUESTIONS**

Noble and Mack discussed where the proposed driveway was relative to the drain field for the septic system.

**APPLICANT
PRESENTATION**

Bill Tanner, 688 Echo Lake Road, represented the applicant. He reviewed the history of the application to the board which started with a complaint from the neighbor about the foundation for the garage. The person who now owns the neighboring property had

no problem with the garage. He passed out a letter from the current neighbor concerning the structure. He continued to review the history of the property and complaint about the garage and what had happened at the Bigfork Land Use Advisory Committee. He said there were a couple of things in the staff report which were unclear. He referred to page ten which concerned the sewer system and the drain field. They had done some investigation on where the drain field was located. He passed a handout to the board with information from Ed Baldy, who was a licensed sewer installer and pictures of where the drain field and foundation were. The existing foundation was significantly away from the drain field. He did not feel there was consistency with the issuance of a stop order if there was a permit issued for a neighbor who had already built a house in the front yard. There were 18 houses on the front part of Echo Lake. Of those 18, 12 already had structures in the front yard. He knew full well those people did not have permits. The Hager's did not feel they were breaking any bylaws when they built their garage. It was just a given. Everybody (12 out of 18) else had garages in the front yard. He handed out pictures of houses which had structures in the front yard on Echo View Road. Staff had also suggested there was plenty of room on the east side of the house for a garage. What staff did not realize, until the snow was gone, was there was a storm sewer which emptied on the east side of the lot. He passed out more pictures of the lot. Staff would not have known of the storm sewer with snow on the ground. The fact was they could not put a garage on the lot without some major work for the drain water done on the system. They agreed they should live by the bylaws. They were here to ask for a variance. They were asking to be granted the same rights as other people on the road. Other people had structures in their front yards. They were only asking for a four inch variance on the south end and six inch variance on the north end of the garage. The front yard variance didn't seem to be applied to anyone else on the street. He was happy to entertain any questions the board might have.

BOARD QUESTIONS

Dyck asked where the replacement field of the septic system was located.

Tanner could not tell him that. He was going off of what the drawing provided. It was not shown anywhere on the map where the replacement field was. He asked Mack to bring up a drawing of the lot. He could not tell the board where the replacement field was. He pointed out where the 30 foot mark was on the

front yard.

Dyck asked if the 30 foot mark was from the center or edge of the road.

Tanner said it was from the edge.

Mack said on the diagram it said to the road center.

Mack, Dyck and Tanner discussed where the easement was.

Netteberg and Tanner discussed why the applicant placed the structure where it was.

Netteberg did not have a problem with the building being in front like everyone else's was located. He saw where they tried to get within the variance of the side yard setback. It looked like they absolutely disregarded the front yard setback.

Tanner said when you look at the picture, he did not know if that was the actual foundation. On the pictures which showed the driveway he didn't think it was right on the property line.

Grieve said the picture of the survey was the applicant's survey.

The board, staff and Tanner discussed the driveway and the road.

Tanner said if the board looked at other pictures of property on the street, they would assume there was no front yard setback. He thought the assumption was made there was no front yard setback because several properties on the street had the same situation.

Netteberg thought anyone with a backhoe would have checked on setbacks.

Tanner said his point was it was not outside of the property line.

Netteberg said it was right to the pin according to the pictures they had.

Tanner said if the board looked at other pictures of properties on the street, they were all pretty much the same. The reason the garage was put so far forward was the property dropped off

substantially so it needed to be brought forward to have an entrance to the garage without having to build a big retaining wall.

Netteberg said the retaining wall was not pointed out to the board as a hardship. According to the pictures, the structure was right on the road.

Mack, Tanner and the board discussed how far the structure was currently from the road, the dimensions of the property and how far the structure appeared to be from the road.

**PUBLIC
COMMENT**

None.

**BOARD
DISCUSSION**

Dyck and Mack discussed if the storm water system was considered an easement and the age of the subdivision which had been approved in 1964.

Netteberg and Mack discussed findings #7 and #9.

Dyck and Mack discussed when side set backs were in place which was 1992.

Netteberg said it was the board's job to go over the findings of fact and justify why they were granting a variance. Ninety percent of the time, they did everything they could to help the applicant. They understood the rules and they also understood common sense. The side yard setbacks were not that much, only a couple of inches. His only issue was the front yard setback. They were not even close to meeting the setbacks.

Dyck said they were not, but other houses on the road were in the front setbacks. His questioned if other people knew what the regulations were for the property. He gave examples of houses in the area which did not meet the setbacks.

The board discussed the location of the garage and other people in the neighborhood. They also talked about where the drain field was located, what was needed for the drain field, the setback and where the garage could not be placed.

Tanner said there was room on the east to put a replacement field.

The board discussed if they had a setback for the garage, the front yard setback and the restrictions of the lot.

Netteberg said it was great to have board meetings, because when he read through the information, more was needed. Their job was to read through the information, keep opinions out and go with what was actually stated which was what was allowable and what was not.

The board discussed options for the garage, the lack of a plat map which showed the building footprint and proposed sewer site and options for replacement of the drain field in the laterals.

Tanner said the positioning of the laterals were wide enough that could be done. Nowadays, the lines were tight, but they used to be wider.

Netteberg said the board paid attention to what BLUAC recommended from their meetings.

Tanner said when they were at the BLUAC meeting, the storm water drain was not uncovered. They did not have the advantage of seeing the storm drain when they made the approval to grant the variance. He thought that further satisfied why the garage could not be on the east side.

The board said it could not go on the east side and they had not heard from any of the neighbors.

Tanner said he had failed to mention he had contacted several of the neighbors all of which were positive. They all had garages in the front yard on either side.

Netteberg said the neighbors should have been notified.

Tanner said they had been.

The board discussed other difficulties with the application and options for the placement of the garage.

Tanner wanted to suggest the road was a dead-end road. There was not a lot of traffic on it. It was a gravel road and it was a dead end road. There were only four houses to the west of this house.

Grieve reminded the board the applicant interjecting during board discussion was a breach of protocol. The chair could accommodate that but he wanted to remind the chair of the breach.

Netteberg acknowledged Grieve's comment.

The board started to read through the findings one by one and discussed them individually.

Grieve clarified the board discussion of where the foundation could not have been poured anywhere beside where it had been poured.

Netteberg said there was a storm drain to the side of the house, the drain field was all the way across the front of the house, the only place it could be placed was where it was, only pushed back toward the lake and they did not know the exact measurement from the lake.

Mack said the dimensions were in the staff report, read them to the board and explained on the visual aide.

Netteberg asked if he had answered Grieve's questions on their discussion.

Grieve said if the board was finding the foundation had to be placed where it was, then they would need a little bit more board discussion on that basis.

Netteberg said the garage could still go straight back and not be so close to the road.

The board discussed the possibility of the garage being placed farther back on the property.

They continued to read the findings of fact and discuss them individually.

Netteberg asked how far the garage would need to be pushed back in order to be outside the front setback.

Mack said the garage would need to be moved 15 feet for the front yard setback or approximately 26 feet to make it in line with the house.

Grieve said there were two zoning provisions which were referenced in the report. One was the front yard setback for the principle structure. The other provision said accessory structures can't be in the front yard and the front yard was anything forward of the line of the house. So to be compliant with both sets of the regulations, it had to be 26 feet from the front property line.

Netteberg said it came back to them as the Board of Adjustment and looking at all the other properties which had structures in the front yard setback.

The board discussed options for the application.

Mack and Grieve said the board did not have a motion on the table currently.

Mack reviewed process for the board.

Dyck asked how the other houses in violation would be addressed.

Grieve said they did not know the structures were in violation. Many of the structures along the road had been built before 1992. Some were built after '92. Determining which structures would be grandfathered would be task number one. Number two would be pursuing any violations. Office policy of enforcement was complaint based enforcement. The office did not go patrolling for violations because an aggrieved party was necessary if the case went to court. Tanner brought up the original complainant was no longer there, but the slate was not wiped clean when that happened. The office still had a pending investigation and had a violation which needed to be dealt with concerning compliance. The office would not go up and down the street looking for violations. The structures would remain there until someone submitted a complaint. It was imperfect but it was similar to a cop sitting on the side of the highway who could not catch every speeder. When they pulled one speeder over, three went by. That was the nature of enforcement in rural areas.

Netteberg said if the board denied this application, they could expect complaints all along that road.

Grieve agreed sometimes people did a scorched earth policy where they had a complaint submitted against them so they go down the road and pick out every single violation on the road. When the office received the complaints they dealt with every one of them.

Noble said this application was similar to an application they had in the past where they would have to rewrite all the findings.

The board discussed the pros and cons of rewriting the findings and options for motions.

They confirmed with Mack the labor involved in rewriting the findings and how the wording would change.

Dyck brought up the difference in elevation for the garage if moved and if the elevation, since the ground sloped, would become a financial burden.

The board discussed if moving the garage back would become a burden.

Grieve suggested getting a motion on the table to adopt the findings of fact so a sub motion could be made to amend the findings as they saw fit. He explained process.

**MAIN MOTION
TO ADOPT
F.O.F.
(FZV-14-04)**

Dyck made a motion seconded by Noble to adopt staff report as findings-of-fact.

**BOARD
DISCUSSION**

Grieve explained process again.

Netteberg read finding of fact #1.

**SECONDARY
MOTION TO
(Amend F.O.F. #1)**

Dyck made a motion seconded by Noble to amend finding of fact #1 to read:

1. Strict compliance with the regulations would ~~not~~ limit the reasonable use of property because the applicant would ~~not~~ be able to construct the detached garage in accordance with the setbacks and outside the front yard without a variance.

**BOARD
DISCUSSION**

None.

**ROLL CALL
VOTE**

(Amend F.O.F. #1)

On a roll call vote the motion passed unanimously.

**BOARD
DISCUSSION**

Netteberg read finding of fact #2.

**SECONDARY
MOTION TO**

(Amend F.O.F. #2)

Dyck made a motion seconded by Noble to amend finding of fact #2 to read:

2. Strict compliance with the regulations would ~~not~~ deprive the applicant of rights enjoyed by other properties on Echo View Drive because the applicant would ~~not~~ be able to construct the detached garage in accordance with the setbacks and outside the front yard without a variance.

**ROLL CALL
VOTE**

(Amend F.O.F. #2)

On a roll call vote the motion passed unanimously.

**BOARD
DISCUSSION**

Netteberg read finding of fact #3.

The board discussed if this was the appropriate finding to have the applicant move the garage back and how to word the motion.

Grieve said he had heard discussion from the board as to if the variance would be conditioned that the foundation be moved back a certain distance. If that was the way the board wished to go, then they would want to have findings of fact which supported the mitigating condition of moving it back. The board would not want to make statements that the foundation was fine where it was. The board would want to make sure the findings reflected the board's discussion so far on that topic.

The board continued to discuss the issue of having the foundation moved and wording of the motion.

**SECONDARY
MOTION TO**

(Amend F.O.F. #3)

Dyck made a motion seconded by Noble to amend finding of fact #3 to read:

3. The alleged hardship ~~does not~~ appears to be the result of lot size, shape ~~or~~ and topography because the garage could be

constructed outside of the *front yard setback and* Lakeshore Protection Zone and 100 year floodplain while in accordance with the applicable zoning regulations.

**ROLL CALL
VOTE
(Amend F.O.F. #3)**

On a roll call vote the motion passed unanimously.

**BOARD
DISCUSSION**

Netteberg read finding of fact #4.

The board discussed possible wording of a motion.

The board and staff discussed if other properties in the area were in the lakeshore protection zone, what were alleged hardships if they were peculiar to this property and criteria for a variance.

**SECONDARY
MOTION TO
(Amend F.O.F. #4)**

Noble made a motion seconded by Dyck to amend finding of fact #4 to read:

4. The alleged hardship does ~~not~~ appears to be peculiar to the subject property because *of the storm water drainage on the east side and limited access to the property.* ~~the accessory structure could be placed in compliance with the applicable zoning regulations and other properties in the neighborhood are located within the Lakeshore Protection Zone and the 100 year Floodplain.~~

**ROLL CALL
VOTE
(Amend F.O.F. #4)**

On a roll call vote the motion passed unanimously.

**BOARD
DISCUSSION**

Netteberg read finding of fact #5.

The board discussed wording for a motion.

**SECONDARY
MOTION TO
(Amend F.O.F. #5)**

Noble made a motion seconded by Dyck to amend finding of fact #5 to read:

5. The alleged hardship ~~is~~ appears to have been created ~~by the applicant~~ because the foundation could have been poured in-line with the existing house *on the east side* and it would not be in the front yard or the front setback and there appears to be ample room to construct the accessory structure outside of the side setback between the house and the east property line.

**ROLL CALL
VOTE**
(Amend F.O.F. #5)

On a roll call vote the motion passed unanimously.

**BOARD
DISCUSSION**

Netteberg read finding of fact #6.

The board discussed possible wording for a motion.

**SECONDARY
MOTION TO**
(Amend F.O.F. #6)

Netteberg made a motion seconded by Dyck to amend finding of fact #6 to read:

6. Reasonable alternatives *do not* exist that would ~~not~~ require a variance from the regulations because the garage could *not* be constructed on the east side of the house in compliance with the bulk and dimensional requirements *because of storm water drainage on the east side.*

**ROLL CALL
VOTE**
(Amend F.O.F. #6)

On a roll call vote the motion passed unanimously.

**BOARD
DISCUSSION**

Netteberg read finding of fact #7.

Grieve reminded the board BLUAC had forwarded an amended finding of fact for #7.

**SECONDARY
MOTION TO**
(Amend F.O.F. #7)

Noble made a motion seconded by Netteberg to adopt the amended finding of fact #7 from the Bigfork Land Use Advisory Committee (BLUAC) which read:

7. Granting of the variance request ~~could would not~~ have an adverse effect on the neighboring properties or the public because ~~this variance is a result of zoning violation, where the original complainant states that the location of the structure impacts his~~ access *has been adjusted.*

**ROLL CALL
VOTE**
(Amend F.O.F. #7)

On a roll call vote the motion passed unanimously.

**BOARD
DISCUSSION**

Netteberg read finding of fact #8.

Grieve said this was where the board would make a finding which would support a condition concerning pushing the garage back on the property. If they ignored the draft finding of the staff

and went back to the criteria, the criteria stated the board had to find the variance requested was the minimum variance which would alleviate hardship.

The board and Grieve discussed what the minimum variance would be to alleviate the hardship and process.

The board discussed alternate wording.

**SECONDARY
MOTION TO
(Amend F.O.F. #8)**

Dyck made a motion seconded by Noble to amend finding of fact #8 to read:

8. The variance requested does not appear to be the minimum variance which would alleviate the alleged hardship because there is an alternative that exist such as building the garage ~~in line with the existing house on the east side and outside the side setback which would eliminate the need for the variance. outside of the front setback.~~

**ROLL CALL
VOTE
(Amend F.O.F. #8)**

On a roll call vote the motion passed unanimously.

**SECONDARY
MOTION TO
(Amend F.O.F. #9)**

Noble made a motion seconded by Netteberg to adopt the amended finding of fact #9 from the Bigfork Land Use Advisory Committee (BLUAC) which read:

9. Granting of the variance ~~is would~~ not ~~likely to~~ confer a special privilege that is denied to other properties in the district ~~because~~ ~~as~~ other properties in the ~~vicinity area~~ appear to have built accessory structures ~~in the setbacks and~~ within the front yards.

**ROLL CALL
VOTE
(Amend F.O.F. #9)**

On a roll call vote the motion passed unanimously.

**BOARD
DISCUSSION**

The board and Grieve discussed process.

**ROLL CALL TO
ADOPT F.O.F.
AS AMENDED
(FZV-14-04)**

On a roll call vote the motion passed unanimously.

BOARD

Grieve reviewed process for the board.

DISCUSSION

MAIN MOTION TO APPROVE (FZV-14-04)

Dyck made a motion seconded by Netteberg to approve the variance with the condition the garage be moved back 15 feet to move it out of the front setback which is the minimum to alleviate the issue.

ROLL CALL TO APPROVE (FZV-14-04)

On a roll call vote the motion passed unanimously.

ROB BRISENDINE- DRAGON BOAT RACES (FCU-15-03) 7:35 pm

A request by Rob Brisendine, on behalf of the Kalispell Convention & Visitor Bureau, for a Conditional Use Permit for a 'Temporary buildings or structures/Temporary Use' on lots located in the 'LS Lakeside (Special Commercial District)' zoning in Lakeside, MT. The applicant is proposing to host the 2015 Montana Dragon Boat Festival in Lakeside September 12-13, 2015.

STAFF REPORT

Mack reviewed FCU-15-03 for the board.

BOARD QUESTIONS

None.

Grieve asked Mack if he wanted to mention contacting the sheriff's office.

Mack said after contacting the sheriff's office it was suggested a condition be added the applicant's contact the sheriff's office and work with them for the event.

APPLICANT PRESENTATION

Diane Medler, 15 Depot Park, summarized who would speak before the board for the applicants which were Lucy Smith, David Fetveit and Rob Brisendine. She gave an overview of the event which included what the event was, when it was held and who participated. She also explained what was provided to the participants, how the races were conducted and what was required from the participants. She talked about how much the races raised, the economic benefits to the area and exposure for the Flathead Valley. She talked about the races being a family friendly event, who they benefited, the different teams which participate and how long the races ran during the weekend. She continued to explain the cost of the festival and the satisfaction and return ratio. The races won Event of the Year for Montana. She explained how the race was funded, the goal of the race, the reasons the race was moved and who the title sponsor was.

Lucy Smith, 192 Juniper Bend Drive, Flathead Community Foundation, explained how they had become involved in the event, the reasons they had become the title sponsor and the use of boats for the nonprofit community which allowed people who did not have their own boat to be part of the event. She described the benefits of having the boats and how they had helped people connect with other non-profit organizations, the chamber and other businesses in the valley. It was a natural fit for them. She said she was impressed with the way the event was organized. It was an investment for them because they raised the money to be the title sponsor and felt they raised the community's energy and opportunities for the non-profit organizations.

David Fetveit, 1091 Lakeside Blvd was a Lakeside resident, founding member of the West Shore Visitors Bureau, president of the Chamber of Commerce in Lakeside/Somers and chairman of the Lakeside Community Council. From the West Shore Visitor's Bureau point of view, they were trying to bring more people to the Lakeside/Somers area. Since he had participated in the event, they recognized there were some challenges they thought could be overcome in Lakeside. As a resident, he supported the event. There were a number of events which happened on the boulevard and he summarized them. As the president of the Chamber of Commerce, they conducted a survey for the feasibility of hosting the event to 109 of their members. Over 95 percent said yes, they were in favor. He was impressed with the organizer's efforts to connect with the community. Concerns were parking, disruption of the neighborhood and homes and businesses in the area. There was a fourth of July event in that area where people were trespassing, etc. The bottom line was it was a great event for economic impact and had to be run right. The organizers had proven in the last three years, they had the ability and organization skills to address the concerns they had.

Rob Brisendine, 15 Depot Park, commended Grieve and Mack on the staff report. The event had been built into one of the top ten festivals in North America. He reviewed the meat and potatoes of the operational portion of the event. The sheriff's office had been contacted and the information had not flowed up. Next time they would start from the top. The concern of traffic was addressed by identifying three primary parcels for parking. There were estimated 100-115 vehicles per acre which could be parked if done right. For all of their events they issued an incident action

plan (IAP). He went on to explain the plan. The parking locations were manned on radio communications with festival staff and emergency personnel. The plan was lot 1 would be first to fill up then lot 2 then lot 3. He went over the number of teams which had participated in past years. This year it looked like 60-65 teams would participate. They anticipated a maximum of 1,200 vehicles parked in the parking lots. The identified spots could easily accommodate that number of cars. Volunteer and staff parking would be designated parking. They anticipated 100 to 120 vehicles for volunteer and staff and their parking would be outside of the footprint of participants' parking. They had received permission to park from the church and other locations which would be able to handle the volunteers and staff. There would be a designated area for handicapped parking only. There was no charge for parking. The event was free as was the parking. It was a family friendly event. They also engaged the Search and Rescue team to protect the area of the races on the water to ensure if there were any issues, they were there to respond immediately. It was a coordinated effort with all the public agencies. He explained various agencies involved in the races. He reviewed the footprint of the event on a visual aide, how many boats were at each site and how the races were conducted. They needed to file for a road closure permit with the county commissioners. They wanted to get approved before they applied for the permit. They wanted to ensure they protected the property owners. He gave examples of steps which had been taken at past events to protect the property owners. They did get approvals from some property owners for access to the event. He said the great thing about Lakeside was, a person could watch two or three races and then do other things. They would promote opportunities to do other things and visit other businesses, etc. There would always be a flow of emergency personnel or vehicles on the closed road. The residents would have access to their condos during the event. Traffic personnel and signage would be in place during the festival coming in or out of Lakeside. He explained the traffic plan on a visual aide. The festival would have more than enough space to erect the team tents, there would be music on site, and he gave the hours they would be playing. When the activities were done for the day, everyone left the site. Overnight security would be in place during the festival to protect the place. Dust control for parking locations would be taken care of with a water truck on standby to mitigate dust. Port a potties would be at each parking location and at volunteer park. They would ensure they were in compliance with Environmental Health. They felt confident they

could adequately and safely support the event. He explained the temporary event signage for the event at the north and south end of Flathead Lake as well as coming into Lakeside from north and south and where traffic control would be stationed. He asked if the board had any questions.

**BOARD
QUESTIONS**

None.

**PUBLIC
COMMENT**

Kip Smith, 137 Ridgeview Drive, volunteer for the festival for the last three years, read a letter of support from the Kalispell Regional Health Care and was for the application.

Jeff Carlson, 137 Scotch Pine Lane, was for the application.

Julie Andes, 577 Sunset Circle, read a letter of support from the president of Glacier Bank and was for the application.

Jo Scott, 211 Double Lake Drive, Flathead Dragonfly team, was for the application.

Alida Tinch, 589 Somers Road, was for the application.

Josh Townsley, 105 Blacktail, was for the application and read an email of support from Don Spearing who was the owner of property next to Volunteer Park.

Deb Newell, was for the application.

Margaret Davis, brought up some discrepancies in the conditions, and the possible problem of people wanting to swim in the lake in the park during the races.

**BOARD
DISCUSSION**

Noble thought the staff report was well done. He thought traffic signals might be appropriate to help with traffic flow.

Dyck agreed.

Noble said the applicant had a proven track record. They were well organized, well run and Lakeside was a better location.

**MAIN MOTION
TO ADOPT
F.O.F.
(FCU-15-03)**

Noble made a motion seconded by Netteberg to accept staff's findings-of-fact in the report for FCU-15-03.

**BOARD
DISCUSSION**

The board briefly discussed if they needed to amend finding of fact #3.

The board and Grieve discussed process.

**ROLL CALL TO
ADOPT F.O.F.
(FCU-15-03)**

On a roll call vote the motion passed unanimously.

**MAIN MOTION
TO AMEND
CONDITION #3,
CONDITION #5
ADD
CONDITION #12
AND APPROVE
(FCU-15-03)**

Noble made a motion to accept the board's conditions as stated by their packet with the amendment to several conditions and approve.

Amend Condition #3 to read:

3. The temporary use proposed on all properties shall be utilized for the Dragon Boat Festival September 9th through the 14th ~~12th and 13th~~, 2015 and with associated staging/preparation activities occurring throughout the week.

Amend Condition #5 to read:

5. The applicant will be required to provide *a minimum of 40* port-a-potties on-site throughout the events for use by participants and spectators.

The board discussed if the addition of another condition was appropriate for traffic.

Grieve asked the board to possibly add a condition so the office could verify the applicant had contacted the sheriff's office concerning traffic, etc.

The board discussed possible wording for the condition.

Condition #12 was added:

12. Coordinate with the Sheriff's department traffic control and the Highway Patrol for safety.

Grieve and the board discussed process.

Netteberg seconded the motion.

**ROLL CALL TO
APPROVE
(FCU-15-03)**

On a roll call vote the motion passed unanimously.

**BOARD
DISCUSSION**

Netteberg said he was impressed with the presentation.

**OLD BUSINESS
8:45 pm**

The board and Grieve briefly discussed where the county was in the process for hiring a new Planning Director.

**NEW BUSINESS
8:47 pm**

The board and staff briefly discussed possible applications for the next meeting.

**ADJOURNMENT
8:48 pm**

The meeting was adjourned at approximately 8:48 pm. on a motion by Dyck. The next meeting will be held at 6:00 p.m. on June 2, 2015.

C. Mark Hash, Chairman

Donna Valade, Recording Secretary

*APPROVED AS **SUBMITTED**/CORRECTED: 6 / 2 / 15*